IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

THURSDAY, THE 6TH DECEMBER 2007 / 15TH AGRAHAYANA 1929

OP.No. 33595 of 2000(Y)

PETITIONER:

THANKAPPAN, S/O.GOVINDAN,
MALIKAKKAL, MEENACHIL P.O.,
KONDADU.

BY ADV. SRI.P.N.PURUSHOTHAMA KAIMAL

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. DEPUTY TAHSILDAR(R.R.),
REVENUE RECOVERY OFFICE,
MEENACHIL, PALA.

2. TODDY WORKERS WELFARE FUND BOARD,
REP. BY CHIEF WELFARE INSPECTOR,
TRIVANDRUM.

3. TODDY WORKERS WELFARE FUND INSPECTOR,
KOTTAYAM.

R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER
R2&3 BY ADV. SRI.A.K.JOHN, SC

THIS ORIGINAL PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 06/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER ON CMP NO.57398/2000 IN OP NO.33595/2000

DISMISSED:

6.12.2007 SD/-(C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, JUDGE.)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

P1: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF R.R. NOTICE ISSUED BY R1 DT.22.11.2000.

TRUE COPY

PA TO JUDGE

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, J.

.....

O.P. No.33595 of 2000

.....

Dated this the 6th day of December, 2007.

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is challenging Ext.P1 whereunder an amount of Rs.1,78,396/- is demanded from the petitioner. All what is stated in Ext.P1 is that petitioner should remit the above amount. Even though two file numbers are given in the notice, it contains nothing else. It is not known whether petitioner is suppressing earlier notice from this court. In any case respondents have not cared to file any counter so far. Even though counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner was only licencee of one toddy shop, that too, in 1998-99, Standing Counsel contended that petitioner was licencee of toddy shop Nos.108, 109 and 127 in the Palai Range during 1997-98 and demand pertains to the said period. In the circumstances, O.P. is disposed of directing the first respondent to call for details of demand from the third respondent and recover the actual amount due from the petitioner after notice to the petitioner giving details of demand with T.S. numbers and period of demand. The first respondent is directed to complete recovery within two months from the date of receipt of copy of this

judgment, failing which respondents 2 or 3 can bring failure to the notice of this court to initiate contempt against the first respondent.

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
Judge

pms